City of Lafayette Staff Report

For:	City Council
By:	Niroop K. Srivatsa
Date Written:	November 17, 2008
Meeting Date:	November 24, 2008
Subject:	**ABAG's *Projections 2009: Third Scenario***

Purpose

To provide the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) with comments on its third scenario of population, household and employment projections for Lafayette and the County.

Projections 2009

In 2008, the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) released two draft scenarios for Projections 2009 - "Scattered Success" and "Focused Future". Scattered Success assumed business as usual, with development trends similar to those envisioned in previous Projections prepared by ABAG. In this scenario, future development will be located in low density, auto-dependent, single-use neighborhoods. In Focused Future, region wide development and redevelopment are focused around transit in the major urban areas and local town centers, creating walkable downtowns and mixed-use neighborhoods. Focused Future also begins to address the requirements of AB 32 - a California law that commits the State to reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050, and SB 375 – a bill which focuses on housing and transportation planning decisions to reduce fossil fuel consumption and conserve farmlands and habitat.

Over half the jurisdictions including Lafayette commented on these two scenarios. Based on the feedback it received, ABAG has now prepared a third and final scenario. The following tables show the differences between the three scenarios for the County, Lafayette and its neighbors for the Year 2035:

Population

Jurisdiction	Scattered Success	Focused Future	**Third Scenario**
Lafayette	27,800	28,834	**28,400**
Moraga	18,900	16,839	**19,000**
Orinda	19,100	19,635	**19,600**
Walnut Creek	97,700	114,909	**99,000**
Pleasant Hill	45,500	49,765	**49,800**
CC County	1,322,200	1,312,851	**1,313,900**

11K

Households

Jurisdiction	Scattered Success	Focused Future	**Third Scenario**
Lafayette	10,930	10,985	**10,990**
Moraga	6,690	5,937	**6,700**
Orinda	7,330	7,515	**7,500**
Walnut Creek	47,590	55,532	**48,000**
Pleasant Hill	19,790	21,744	**21,740**
CC County	489,650	478,830	**481,008**

Jobs

Jurisdiction	Scattered Success	Focused Future	**Third Scenario**
Lafayette	12,060	12,080	**11,960**
Moraga	6,290	6,078	**6,050**
Orinda	6,910	6,978	**6,950**
Walnut Creek	77,300	81,274	**78,470**
Pleasant Hill	23,780	28,024	**27,610**
CC County	590,650	569,940	**556,650**

While ABAG staff tested the first two scenarios against performance targets to determine how well they performed, they have not provided an analysis for the third scenario. The impacts of this scenario will be discussed at a forum to be held on Monday, February 9th at the ABAG offices. Staff will attend that meeting. The deadline for submitting comments on the third scenario is February 20, 2009.

Staff Comments

In general, the population and household projections of the third scenario fall somewhere between the projections of Scattered Success and Focused Future. According to ABAG staff, the third scenario assumes reductions in the overall employment forecasts to recognize the current economic slow down. Similar reductions to housing units to reflect the housing downturn have not been made.

For Lafayette, the third scenario projects a slight increase in the number of households and a decrease in the number of jobs. But overall, there is not a significant difference between the three scenarios for our city. What needs clarification are the factors and performance targets that were used in the evaluation and Lafayette had asked for this information last December. ABAG indicated that written responses to comments would be provided by the end of January but no response has been received to date. Staff recommends that a second letter (draft attached) reiterating Lafayette's request be forwarded to ABAG.

Recommendation

Authorize staff to forward the attached letter to ABAG.

Attachments

1. December 2008 letter
2. Projections 2009: third scenario
3. Draft letter to ABAG

LAFAYETTE
SETTLED 1848 == INCORPORATED 1968

CITY COUNCIL

Don Tatzin, Mayor
Brandt Andersson, Vice Mayor
Mike Anderson, Council Member
Carl Anduri, Council Member
Carol Federighi, Council Member

February 10, 2009

Rose Jacobs Gibson
President, ABAG Executive Board
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607

Dear Ms Gibson:

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to review the third scenario prepared by ABAG staff. The Lafayette City Council considered this matter on February 9th and directed me to forward our comments to your staff.

On December 4, 2008, Lafayette submitted a letter asking for an explanation of the factors and strategies that were used in developing the two first scenarios. We have not yet received a response to our request. We cannot provide meaningful comments on the population and employment projections unless we understand the assumptions that were made in developing the three scenarios. Therefore we ask that the deadline to submit comments be extended to provide us with adequate time to prepare a response after receipt of the requested information. A copy of the previous letter is attached.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Niroop K. Srivatsa
Planning and Building Services Manager

3675 MT. DIABLO BLVD., SUITE 210, LAFAYETTE, CA 94549
TELEPHONE: (925) 284-1968 FAX: (925) 284-3169
http//:www.ci.lafayette.ca.us

LAFAYETTE
SETTLED 1848 — INCORPORATED 1968

CITY COUNCIL

Mike Anderson, Mayor
Don Tatzin, Vice Mayor
Brandt Andersson, Council Member
Carl Anduri, Council Member
Carol Federighi, Council Member

December 4, 2008

Rose Jacobs Gibson
President, ABAG Executive Board
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607

Dear Ms Gibson:

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to review the draft scenarios prepared by ABAG staff for Projections 2009. The Lafayette City Council considered this matter on November 24th and directed me to forward our comments and questions to your staff. At this stage, the City has a number of basic questions on the factors and strategies that were used in developing the two scenarios. A response to the following questions would help us better understand the methodologies that were used to develop the population and job estimates for the Bay Area, Contra Costa County and Lafayette.

Strategies: Infrastructure, land use, pricing, behavioral changes, technology

1. We would like a thorough explanation of each of the strategies that were used in conjunction with land use to reach the 2035 carbon emission reduction target and the assumptions made for each strategy. For example, in the case of infrastructure, what kinds of highway and transit projects were included? Will Marin and Sonoma Counties have transit facilities by 2035 so that they will be able to accommodate additional population? If the answer is "no", why wasn't this included given that these are long range forecasts?

2. When the scenarios were prepared, the price of gasoline was slightly over $4 a gallon. Today, gasoline costs less than $2 a gallon. What was the price of gasoline in the evaluation and is it a realistic price?

Role of land use

1. In the publication "*projections 2009: what if?*", are the differences between the Scattered Success and Focused Future scenarios attributed to just land use changes or do they include other strategies like infrastructural improvements, pricing, technology and behavioral changes?

2. In an earlier power point presentation, ABAG staff explained that land use was not sufficient to reduce carbon emissions to the 2035 target and other strategies such as those listed above would have to be employed in conjunction with land use to reach the target. What impact does land use alone have on achieving the target?

Environmental and infrastructural impacts of Focused Future

1. The Focused Future scenario requires that the larger cities and jurisdictions with transit facilities take on additional populations and jobs. Has ABAG studied what impact this will have on traffic congestion, air quality, school enrollment, and public facilities and services within these

3675 MT. DIABLO BLVD., SUITE 210, LAFAYETTE, CA 94549
TELEPHONE: (925) 284-1968 FAX: (925) 284-3169
http//:www.ci.lafayette.ca.us

communities? As you know, Lafayette is a mature, built-out community with relatively little land to accommodate additional development. Most of the remaining vacant land is located in environmentally constrained areas characterized by steep hillsides, oak woodlands, and unstable soil conditions. Additionally, while Lafayette has a transit station, it does not have adequate infrastructure improvements such as buses and shuttles to service the transit station.

Greenfield development

1. A factor used in the scenarios is the limitation of greenfield development to 900 acres per year. What is the definition of greenfield development? Is this limitation for the entire Bay Area? Will it include land that is already entitled or governed by development agreements? Will there be a cap established for each jurisdiction?

We thank you again for allowing us to comment on the scenarios and look forward to receiving responses to our comments. We appreciate and commend ABAG for reaching out to the member jurisdictions for early input.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Niroop K. Srivatsa
Planning and Building Services Manager

DRAFT

Projections 2009

Third Scenario

Region

Association of Bay Area Governments

Jan. 22, 2009

TOTAL POPULATION

COUNTIES	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035
ALAMEDA	1,443,741	1,505,300	1,549,800	1,626,000	1,705,700	1,787,000	1,874,200	1,965,800
CONTRA COSTA	948,816	1,023,400	1,092,900	1,129,700	1,174,600	1,219,600	1,266,500	1,313,900
MARIN	247,289	252,600	256,500	260,300	264,000	267,300	270,900	274,300
NAPA	124,279	133,700	138,800	142,300	144,600	146,300	147,500	148,800
SAN FRANCISCO	776,733	795,800	805,000	829,500	872,100	914,500	956,800	999,000
SAN MATEO	707,163	721,900	733,200	766,600	801,100	832,300	862,800	893,000
SANTA CLARA	1,682,585	1,763,000	1,822,000	1,945,300	2,063,100	2,185,800	2,310,800	2,431,400
SOLANO	394,542	421,600	443,100	457,500	470,100	481,600	491,800	501,500
SONOMA	458,614	478,800	497,700	510,400	523,900	536,400	548,300	560,100
REGION	**6,783,762**	**7,096,100**	**7,339,000**	**7,667,600**	**8,019,200**	**8,370,800**	**8,729,600**	**9,087,800**
METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS (MSA)								
NAPA	124,279	133,700	138,800	142,300	144,600	146,300	147,500	148,800
SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND-FREMONT	4,123,742	4,299,000	4,437,400	4,612,100	4,817,500	5,020,700	5,231,200	5,446,000
SAN JOSE-SUNNYVALE-SANTA CLARA*	1,682,585	1,763,000	1,822,000	1,945,300	2,063,100	2,185,800	2,310,800	2,431,400
SANTA ROSA-PETALUMA	458,614	478,800	497,700	510,400	523,900	536,400	548,300	560,100
VALLEJO-FAIRFIELD	394,542	421,600	443,100	457,500	470,100	481,600	491,800	501,500

* Data does not include San Benito County

HOUSEHOLD POPULATION

COUNTIES	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035
ALAMEDA	1,416,006	1,477,000	1,520,800	1,594,500	1,673,600	1,754,100	1,840,000	1,931,400
CONTRA COSTA	937,479	1,012,100	1,081,400	1,117,900	1,162,500	1,207,400	1,254,300	1,301,700
MARIN	235,803	241,300	245,000	248,500	252,100	255,300	258,900	262,300
NAPA	119,046	128,400	133,400	136,800	139,000	140,600	141,800	143,100
SAN FRANCISCO	756,976	775,500	784,100	808,400	850,800	893,200	935,000	977,200
SAN MATEO	696,713	711,500	721,400	754,500	788,600	819,800	850,300	880,500
SANTA CLARA	1,652,871	1,732,900	1,791,100	1,914,100	2,031,600	2,154,300	2,279,300	2,399,900
SOLANO	378,568	405,200	426,700	441,100	453,500	465,000	475,200	484,900
SONOMA	447,512	467,600	486,400	499,100	512,400	524,900	536,800	548,600
REGION	**6,640,974**	**6,951,500**	**7,190,300**	**7,514,900**	**7,864,100**	**8,214,600**	**8,571,600**	**8,929,600**
METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS (MSA)								
NAPA	119,046	128,400	133,400	136,800	139,000	140,600	141,800	143,100
SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND-FREMONT	4,042,977	4,217,400	4,352,700	4,523,800	4,727,600	4,929,800	5,138,500	5,353,100
SAN JOSE-SUNNYVALE-SANTA CLARA*	1,652,871	1,732,900	1,791,100	1,914,100	2,031,600	2,154,300	2,279,300	2,399,900
SANTA ROSA-PETALUMA	447,512	467,600	486,400	499,100	512,400	524,900	536,800	548,600
VALLEJO-FAIRFIELD	378,568	405,200	426,700	441,100	453,500	465,000	475,200	484,900

* Data does not include San Benito County

HOUSEHOLDS

COUNTIES	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035
ALAMEDA	523,366	543,790	557,270	585,350	615,370	645,530	676,080	707,710
CONTRA COSTA	344,129	368,310	393,710	407,589	424,972	442,965	461,962	481,008
MARIN	100,650	103,180	104,550	105,870	107,420	108,990	110,610	112,170
NAPA	45,402	49,270	51,260	52,180	52,800	53,430	54,030	54,640
SAN FRANCISCO	329,700	338,920	346,680	360,170	374,750	389,800	404,700	420,000
SAN MATEO	254,104	260,070	264,400	275,483	287,201	299,123	310,924	322,620
SANTA CLARA	565,863	595,700	614,000	653,803	696,533	739,818	785,092	827,330
SOLANO	130,403	142,040	148,160	152,330	156,480	160,740	164,890	169,290
SONOMA	172,403	181,800	188,340	192,650	197,160	201,790	206,570	211,350
REGION	**2,466,020**	**2,583,080**	**2,668,370**	**2,785,424**	**2,912,686**	**3,042,186**	**3,174,858**	**3,306,118**
METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS (MSA)								
NAPA	45,402	49,270	51,260	52,180	52,800	53,430	54,030	54,640
SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND-FREMONT	1,551,949	1,614,270	1,666,610	1,734,461	1,809,713	1,886,408	1,964,276	2,043,508
SAN JOSE-SUNNYVALE-SANTA CLARA*	565,863	595,700	614,000	653,803	696,533	739,818	785,092	827,330
SANTA ROSA-PETALUMA	172,403	181,800	188,340	192,650	197,160	201,790	206,570	211,350
VALLEJO-FAIRFIELD	130,403	142,040	148,160	152,330	156,480	160,740	164,890	169,290

* Data does not include San Benito County

TOTAL JOBS

COUNTIES	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035
ALAMEDA	750,160	730,270	712,850	764,270	829,570	900,410	974,790	1,043,680
CONTRA COSTA	371,310	379,030	376,820	409,650	444,350	477,850	516,910	556,650
MARIN	134,180	135,470	135,600	139,110	143,780	148,310	152,830	158,280
NAPA	66,360	70,690	70,770	75,180	79,920	84,370	88,770	92,980
SAN FRANCISCO	642,500	553,090	568,730	618,540	671,190	730,830	796,100	866,830
SAN MATEO	386,590	337,350	346,320	373,370	404,400	439,850	473,290	505,860
SANTA CLARA	1,044,130	872,860	906,270	967,830	1,046,480	1,134,320	1,235,890	1,345,620
SOLANO	136,740	150,520	140,120	152,530	167,060	181,850	195,230	209,880
SONOMA	221,490	220,460	218,360	236,710	257,740	278,510	301,120	325,110
REGION	**3,753,460**	**3,449,740**	**3,475,840**	**3,737,190**	**4,044,490**	**4,376,300**	**4,734,930**	**5,104,890**
METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS (MSA)								
NAPA	66,360	70,690	70,770	75,180	79,920	84,370	88,770	92,980
SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND-FREMONT	2,284,740	2,135,210	2,140,320	2,304,940	2,493,290	2,697,250	2,913,920	3,131,300
SAN JOSE-SUNNYVALE-SANTA CLARA*	1,044,130	872,860	906,270	967,830	1,046,480	1,134,320	1,235,890	1,345,620
SANTA ROSA-PETALUMA	221,490	220,460	218,360	236,710	257,740	278,510	301,120	325,110
VALLEJO-FAIRFIELD	136,740	150,520	140,120	152,530	167,060	181,850	195,230	209,880

* Data does not include San Benito County

DRAFT

Projections 2009

Third Scenario

Contra Costa County

Association of Bay Area Governments

Jan. 22, 2009

TOTAL POPULATION

SUBREGIONAL STUDY AREA	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035
ANTIOCH**	91,293	102,300	108,500	111,000	113,500	115,400	117,600	120,000
BRENTWOOD**	24,385	44,600	61,500	64,300	67,700	71,200	74,600	77,900
CLAYTON**	10,863	11,100	11,300	11,500	11,500	11,600	11,700	11,700
CONCORD**	124,467	128,300	133,100	135,800	140,500	145,700	151,900	158,100
DANVILLE**	42,958	44,700	45,100	46,700	48,200	49,700	50,900	52,300
EL CERRITO**	29,116	29,300	29,600	29,800	30,400	31,000	31,600	32,200
HERCULES**	19,497	23,600	25,300	26,600	28,400	30,600	32,800	34,900
LAFAYETTE**	25,334	25,800	25,900	26,400	27,000	27,500	27,900	28,400
MARTINEZ**	42,061	43,300	43,800	45,100	46,100	46,800	48,100	49,300
MORAGA**	16,333	16,500	16,700	17,000	17,500	17,900	18,400	19,000
OAKLEY**	26,803	31,500	36,500	37,600	38,500	39,200	40,200	41,200
ORINDA**	17,599	17,800	17,800	18,100	18,400	18,900	19,200	19,600
PINOLE**	30,806	31,700	32,200	34,000	35,400	37,000	38,400	39,800
PITTSBURG**	77,479	84,000	89,900	93,400	100,000	106,300	113,900	121,600
PLEASANT HILL**	39,186	40,100	41,800	42,200	44,400	45,900	47,700	49,800
RICHMOND**	115,443	120,000	123,000	131,100	138,500	146,500	153,700	161,000
SAN PABLO**	34,215	35,100	36,500	37,200	38,600	40,000	41,400	42,500
SAN RAMON***	44,834	52,000	63,000	67,000	71,400	76,300	80,900	85,600
WALNUT CREEK**	78,848	81,200	87,300	89,500	91,900	94,300	96,700	99,000
ALAMO-BLACKHAWK***	23,809	25,000	25,200	25,600	26,000	26,100	26,300	26,500
RODEO-CROCKETT***	11,911	12,500	13,500	13,500	13,600	13,800	13,900	14,000
RURAL EAST C. C. CO.***	15,193	16,200	18,100	18,800	19,400	20,100	20,700	21,400
REMAINDER	6,383	6,800	7,300	7,500	7,700	7,800	8,000	8,100
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY	**948,816**	**1,023,400**	**1,092,900**	**1,129,700**	**1,174,600**	**1,219,600**	**1,266,500**	**1,313,900**

*CITY **CITY SPHERE OF INFLUENCE ***OTHER SUBREGIONAL AREA

HOUSEHOLD POPULATION

SUBREGIONAL STUDY AREA	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035
ANTIOCH**	90,877	101,900	108,100	110,600	113,100	115,000	117,200	119,600
BRENTWOOD**	24,348	44,600	61,500	64,300	67,700	71,200	74,600	77,900
CLAYTON**	10,837	11,100	11,300	11,500	11,500	11,600	11,700	11,700
CONCORD**	123,020	126,900	131,700	134,300	139,000	144,100	150,300	156,500
DANVILLE**	42,494	44,200	44,600	46,200	47,700	49,200	50,400	51,800
EL CERRITO**	28,934	29,100	29,400	29,600	30,200	30,800	31,400	32,000
HERCULES**	19,458	23,600	25,300	26,600	28,400	30,600	32,800	34,900
LAFAYETTE**	25,198	25,700	25,800	26,300	26,900	27,400	27,800	28,300
MARTINEZ**	40,645	41,900	42,400	43,600	44,600	45,300	46,600	47,800
MORAGA**	14,702	14,900	15,000	15,300	15,700	16,100	16,600	17,200
OAKLEY**	26,720	31,400	36,400	37,500	38,400	39,100	40,100	41,100
ORINDA**	17,532	17,700	17,700	18,000	18,300	18,800	19,100	19,500
PINOLE**	30,552	31,400	31,900	33,700	35,100	36,700	38,100	39,500
PITTSBURG**	76,794	83,300	89,200	92,700	99,300	105,600	113,200	120,900
PLEASANT HILL**	38,720	39,600	41,300	41,700	43,900	45,400	47,200	49,300
RICHMOND**	113,775	118,300	121,300	129,300	136,700	144,700	151,900	159,200
SAN PABLO**	33,721	34,600	36,000	36,700	38,100	39,500	40,900	42,000
SAN RAMON***	44,749	51,900	62,900	66,900	71,300	76,200	80,800	85,500
WALNUT CREEK**	77,845	80,200	86,300	88,500	90,800	93,200	95,600	97,900
ALAMO-BLACKHAWK***	23,666	24,900	25,100	25,500	25,800	25,900	26,100	26,300
RODEO-CROCKETT***	11,844	12,400	13,400	13,400	13,500	13,700	13,800	13,900
RURAL EAST C. C. CO.***	14,941	16,000	17,800	18,500	19,100	19,800	20,400	21,100
REMAINDER	6,107	6,500	7,000	7,200	7,400	7,500	7,700	7,800
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY	**937,479**	**1,012,100**	**1,081,400**	**1,117,900**	**1,162,500**	**1,207,400**	**1,254,300**	**1,301,700**

*CITY **CITY SPHERE OF INFLUENCE ***OTHER SUBREGIONAL AREA

HOUSEHOLDS

SUBREGIONAL STUDY AREA	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035
ANTIOCH**	29,656	33,090	35,130	36,080	37,030	37,970	38,880	39,820
BRENTWOOD**	7,899	14,400	19,710	20,760	21,840	22,950	24,080	25,210
CLAYTON**	3,921	4,000	4,090	4,120	4,150	4,170	4,190	4,220
CONCORD**	44,972	46,130	48,100	49,234	51,350	53,680	56,140	58,600
DANVILLE**	15,266	15,820	16,090	16,610	17,120	17,620	18,110	18,590
EL CERRITO**	12,825	12,960	13,110	13,283	13,524	13,772	14,021	14,250
HERCULES**	6,428	7,750	8,370	8,870	9,540	10,280	11,020	11,770
LAFAYETTE**	9,682	9,840	9,910	10,080	10,260	10,480	10,720	10,990
MARTINEZ**	16,583	16,980	17,330	17,770	18,200	18,660	19,120	19,580
MORAGA**	5,674	5,730	5,820	5,900	6,060	6,265	6,470	6,700
OAKLEY**	8,294	9,730	11,210	11,500	11,800	12,120	12,450	12,800
ORINDA**	6,596	6,670	6,700	6,880	7,060	7,230	7,370	7,500
PINOLE**	10,505	10,720	10,950	11,530	12,100	12,670	13,250	13,830
PITTSBURG**	24,001	25,910	27,850	29,185	31,241	33,290	35,750	38,210
PLEASANT HILL**	16,565	16,910	17,720	17,943	18,932	19,754	20,790	21,740
RICHMOND**	40,563	42,000	43,450	46,290	49,140	51,960	55,030	58,060
SAN PABLO**	10,219	10,550	10,960	11,180	11,570	11,970	12,340	12,700
SAN RAMON***	16,981	19,590	23,780	25,320	27,140	29,060	30,980	32,890
WALNUT CREEK**	37,086	38,060	40,550	41,750	43,100	44,700	46,300	48,000
ALAMO-BLACKHAWK***	8,022	8,420	8,490	8,590	8,700	8,820	8,950	9,090
RODEO-CROCKETT***	4,373	4,550	4,940	4,980	5,040	5,120	5,190	5,270
RURAL EAST C. C. CO.***	5,737	6,090	6,830	7,050	7,330	7,650	7,970	8,290
REMAINDER	2,281	2,410	2,620	2,683	2,746	2,774	2,841	2,898
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY	**344,129**	**368,310**	**393,710**	**407,589**	**424,972**	**442,965**	**461,962**	**481,008**

*CITY **CITY SPHERE OF INFLUENCE ***OTHER SUBREGIONAL AREA

TOTAL JOBS

SUBREGIONAL STUDY AREA	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035
ANTIOCH**	20,440	21,270	21,020	25,310	29,660	31,810	34,250	36,800
BRENTWOOD**	7,480	7,610	7,470	8,830	9,580	10,810	12,270	13,470
CLAYTON**	1,390	1,440	1,430	1,520	1,600	1,680	1,780	1,850
CONCORD**	66,180	67,530	67,280	69,670	72,250	78,490	86,910	95,960
DANVILLE**	14,740	15,090	15,020	16,130	17,020	17,150	17,310	17,420
EL CERRITO**	6,470	6,650	6,640	7,080	7,780	8,360	9,150	9,900
HERCULES**	2,890	2,980	2,910	3,440	3,630	4,270	5,050	5,770
LAFAYETTE**	10,790	11,390	11,330	11,360	11,390	11,470	11,620	11,960
MARTINEZ**	21,250	22,000	21,880	24,100	26,570	28,850	31,350	34,010
MORAGA**	4,940	5,040	5,030	5,370	5,820	5,890	5,960	6,050
OAKLEY**	3,270	3,400	3,310	4,200	4,800	5,840	7,150	8,310
ORINDA**	6,230	6,230	6,220	6,450	6,750	6,810	6,880	6,950
PINOLE**	6,200	6,470	6,350	6,380	6,410	6,470	7,370	8,210
PITTSBURG**	17,470	18,260	17,960	22,090	25,990	29,830	34,420	38,630
PLEASANT HILL**	17,660	17,990	17,960	20,580	23,750	24,910	26,230	27,610
RICHMOND**	42,520	44,330	44,070	50,680	57,610	62,670	67,850	73,560
SAN PABLO**	6,250	6,190	6,150	6,230	6,310	7,180	8,230	9,120
SAN RAMON***	40,140	40,110	39,850	42,010	44,000	46,780	49,620	52,200
WALNUT CREEK**	62,040	62,140	62,080	63,380	65,960	70,160	74,070	78,470
ALAMO-BLACKHAWK***	5,390	5,430	5,430	6,300	7,710	7,780	7,870	7,930
RODEO-CROCKETT***	2,530	2,660	2,650	2,900	3,220	3,560	3,950	4,310
RURAL EAST C. C. CO.***	4,090	3,910	3,870	4,590	5,260	5,760	6,240	6,740
REMAINDER	950	910	910	1,050	1,280	1,320	1,380	1,420
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY	**371,310**	**379,030**	**376,820**	**409,650**	**444,350**	**477,850**	**516,910**	**556,650**

*CITY **CITY SPHERE OF INFLUENCE ***OTHER SUBREGIONAL AREA

ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

Representing City and County Governments of the San Francisco Bay Area

ABAG

January 30, 2009

Niroop K. Srivatsa
Planning and Building Services Manager
City of Lafayette
3675 Mt. Diablo Blvd., Suite 210
Lafayette, CA 94549

RECEIVED
FEB 0 4 2008
CITY OF LAFAYETTE
PLANNING DEPT.

Dear Ms. Srivatsa:

Thank you for your comments on the Draft *Projections 2009*. I wanted to finally respond to your letter of December 4, 2008, in addition to the other contacts you and ABAG staff have had.

Scenario and Land Use Assumptions

The *Scattered Success* scenario is a continuation of the policy-based forecast, using a similar methodology to *Projections 2007*. The *Scattered Success* scenario uses local existing general plans to drive development potential. Additional policy-based development potential is used for the years 2015 and beyond in a manner that is broadly consistent with existing plans but resulting in a more "Smart-Growth"-based projection. *Focused Future* takes the *Scattered Success* scenario a step further by making adjustments in jobs and housing allocations between counties, within counties, and within cities, reallocating growth to areas we think will have less negative impact. We did this by assigning housing and jobs more to areas that would yield fewer vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per household and per job. In the *Focused Future* scenario, we assume that at both county and city levels, growth will primarily occur in areas adjacent to BART stations and other transit services as well as in Priority Development Areas (PDAs). While such assumptions exist in *Scattered Success*, the redirection of growth in *Focused Future* is much more intensive. This reallocation of growth and their inherent land use changes are the only differences between the two scenarios.

Consistent with the *Focused Future* scenario, we anticipate that the additional growth in jobs and population for Lafayette will occur with smaller developments throughout the city and through conversions to more intense land uses, with particular emphasis on the BART station area and the Lafayette Redevelopment Area PDA.

Transportation and Pricing Assumptions

Both land use scenarios assume the completion of the transportation investments, as described in MTC's 2007 Transportation Investment Plan. This includes MTC's Regional Transit Expansion Program, adopted in 2001, as Resolution 3434. This Resolution lists a number of future rail projects, including the Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) train service between Marin and Sonoma counties. Construction activity for this project should start in 2011, with train service scheduled to begin in 2014.

The transportation assumptions also include costs and pricing. These cost assumptions include a 2035 gas price of $3.79 per gallon (2007 dollars). This would be an average price, anticipating the highs and lows in prices that we might expect to see throughout the forecast period. We believe this is a reasonable assumption.

A more detailed description of the transportation assumptions can be found in MTC's "Travel Forecasts for the San Francisco Bay Area 2009 Regional Transportation Plan, Vision 2035 Analysis, Data Summary", November 2007. The alternative used for *Projections 2009* is the Baseline alternative. This document can be found at:
http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/2035_plan/tech_data_summary_report.pdf

Performance Targets

The performance targets were adopted by the ABAG Executive Board in October 2008. These targets measure travel, congestion, emissions, greenfield development, and equity. We did not measure school enrollment, public facilities and other services. The "what if?" publication documents how the two scenarios performed against each target, by county and for the region as a whole. These measurements represent the changes attributed to changes in land use only. As documented in "what if?", we show that land use does make a difference in meeting each of the targets, but that we cannot reach these targets by land use changes alone. Additional changes to our transportation infrastructure, new technologies, pricing strategies, and behavioral changes are all needed to achieve our goals. However, because our objective was to measure the impact of land use, it is important to note that these additional changes are not included in either scenario.

The measurement of greenfield development is a way for us to look at not only how much new land we are using with new development, but also how efficiently we are using existing urban land. The 900 acres per year limit on greenfield development is a measurement for the entire region. It is the one target that we did not measure by city or county. Like all the other performance targets, it is not a mandate or a requirement and the target does not establish a cap for the region or for local jurisdictions. Rather, the greenfield target is a way to see how well we measure up to the goal we set. For this target, we used our forecasting model to track how much vacant land was used, including previously developed lands that are now vacant. While our measurement may include some of these non-greenfield lands, we believe that our measurement provides a fairly accurate assessment of greenfield development.

Again, thank you for your comments.

Sincerely,

Paul Fassinger
Research Director